

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 086

SO 000 663

TITLE The American Historical Association's History Education Project: The Status of the Project and its Regional Teams as of the End of 1970.

INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Dept. of History.

SPONS AGENCY American Historical Association, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

PUB DATE Dec 70

NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation, *Curriculum Development, Diffusion, Educational Change, Educational Innovation, Effective Teaching, *History Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Interinstitutional Cooperation, National Programs, Preservice Education, Professional Education, *Projects, *Social Studies, *Teacher Education

IDENTIFIERS History Education Project

ABSTRACT

This report gives an overview of History Education Project (HEP) operational structure and a summary of activities of its 13 regional teams. HEP is committed to the improvement of history education and to the training of history teachers for all educational levels. Some goals are to: 1) define objectives of history instruction; 2) identify, across disciplines and levels, those professional historians interested in problems of history education; 3) disseminate information about curriculum change; 4) utilize this information and end artificial barriers between schools and colleges; and, 5) promote cooperative and self-sustaining operations on a national basis. Primary emphasis the first two years has been on the pre-collegiate teacher, his training and professional responsibilities. Regional teams are active in projects to develop preservice and inservice teacher education programs, implement new degree programs and course requirements, devise relevant curriculum, and organize materials centers and traveling institutes to demonstrate techniques and materials. A new journal to concentrate on the classroom, teaching, curriculum, and teacher preparation is also planned. Detailed observations of regional team projects will appear in a "Report to the Profession" publication intended for fall 1971.

(Author/JSB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATE. DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION'S HISTORY EDUCATION PROJECT:

The Status of the Project and its Regional Teams as of the End of 1970

The History Education Project commenced operations on February 1, 1969, out of an office at Indiana University. It is jointly sponsored by the American Historical Association, the Indiana University History Department, and the Social Studies Development Center. Initial funds were provided by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, under the Educations Professions Development Act. In February of 1970, the grant was renewed through the end of June, 1971. However, funds have also been contributed by the American Historical Association, several school districts and institutions of higher education, book and film publishers, and even by private individuals -- in all cases, without stipulations other than those imposed by federal laws governing the use of E.P.D.A. grants.

H.E.P. is national in scope. It is committed to the improvement of history education and the training of teachers of history, grades kindergarten through Ph.D., with a primary emphasis throughout its first two years of existence on the pre-collegiate teacher, his training and his professional responsibilities. Some of the goals of the Project are to (1) define the educational objectives of history in the school curricula; (2) identify those who are interested in this problem, both in the profession and in other disciplines, among educationists and teachers; (3) to disseminate information about change and the development of new materials, curricula, methods and other things relevant to the better teaching of history; (4) to get these materials and ideas to the schools and colleges and to build lasting liaisons between persons in the universities and colleges and teachers and administrators in the schools so as to end the artificial separation between institutions and the isolation of interested individuals at all levels of education from

each other; and (5) as a result of the above, to promote cooperative and self-sustaining operations in and out of the profession, on a national basis, aimed at the overall improvement of history teaching and the training of history teachers.

The operational device used by H.E.P. for the two and a half years of its existence to bring about the above aims has been the building, training, and operation of regional teams. H.E.P. has sponsored and subsidized some thirteen of these since summer of 1969, while several others have come into being largely at their own expense and through the cooperation of one of the thirteen H.E.P. teams organized and developed by the Project itself.¹ There have also been a few cases of independently instigated projects which have become affiliated with H.E.P. soon after the time of their inception. It is possible that the Project will ask still others, independently funded and operated, to become associated with H.E.P. if and when such an association seems to serve the needs of the individual projects and also of H.E.P. The American Political Science Association has collected under the aegis of its Pre-collegiate Education Project several individual enterprises that both predate A.P.S.A.P.E.P. and are funded independently of it. This has been done in an attempt to coordinate programs dealing with pre-collegiate political science education and teacher-training.²

Policy decisions, supervision, and general evaluation have been carried on for H.E.P. from its inception by an Advisory Committee, appointed by the Association's Council from among A.H.A.'s relevant standing committees and at-large membership, but comprising as well three persons not representing the Association. The latter consist of a member from the schools, one from the field of counseling and guidance, and one serving as liaison with the Council of State Specialists for Social Studies, who is on the staff of a

state department of education.³ Day to day direction of the History Education Project comes from the Office of the Director at Indiana University (The Director is appointed by the A.H.A. Council, with the approval of the Indiana University History Department). Presently, the Project is directed by Eugene L. Asher, Department of History, Indiana University, and Phillip Mow, School of Education, Indiana University.

Planning for recruitment and training in 1970 was also aided by a local advisory committee to the Director at Indiana University. This Indiana University committee was an arm of the director's office and did not share in the policy-making function of the National Committee. Its work is now confined to the regional team at Indiana University, since no national training program will be conducted by H.E.P. in 1971.

The History Education Project has had no doctrinaire line to impose upon its members, but has followed a very catholic policy during its first two years of existence. It has conducted training and planning for team members whenever possible, both at Bloomington and regionally. After a summer institute at Bloomington, Indiana, in 1969, to which were brought educators, psychologists, historians, representatives of existing social studies projects, and other specialists -- all as staff to serve the planning needs of the members of the first six regional teams, who were assembled there at the time for six weeks of intensive study, debate, and planning, we restructured the training for the regional teams brought in at the beginning of 1970 in order to allow as much as possible of the planning to take place where operations would actually commence regionally in the summer or fall of 1970. The latter format allowed, we thought, for the immediate identification of and participation in planning by key local personages in the schools and educational structure in order to integrate them appropriately

into the operation of the regional programs. Regional teams, made up in 1969 of members from the schools, departments of education, and professional (college or university) historians, were altered in 1970 to include as well graduate students in history and/or social studies education.

Actual operations of each regional team vary greatly, having in common only the denomination of training teachers in each instance. Some regional teams have addressed themselves to special curriculum needs of the schools in their locales; others to the need for massive in-service training of teachers in surrounding school districts in order to bring them abreast of the latest developments in the field of history (and sometimes social studies) education; still others have found their purposes best served by designing and executing special degree and credential courses and even degree programs for teachers and potential teachers; while still other teams have concentrated on the creation of centers to serve the needs of local schools for assistance in acquiring materials and redesigning courses or have created, with the aid of non-historians in the social sciences, multi-disciplinary courses or segments of courses for use in the schools and colleges. Much of this work is still in the planning, development, or pilot stage. We expect the Advisory Committee to publish a Report to the Profession in the summer or fall of 1971. This Report will be based largely on the observations by Committee members of the work of the regional teams. Each Advisory Committee member has been assigned a regional team to visit and assist. In addition, the H.E.P. hired Dr. Joseph Bentley, University of Utah, as consultant to and evaluator of individual regional projects and of the H.E.P. itself.

The criteria for judging such a vast and varied program are difficult to specify. Ultimately they will have to take into consideration the state of history education in the areas impacted by H.E.P. as opposed to

that in areas not so impacted. But benchmarks can be identified even now in the number and quality of "spin-offs" from H.E.P. teams. Several of these exist, as stated above, principally in the Texas and New Mexico areas, as a consequence of the efforts of the Southern Methodist - Dallas Schools team, and in the California State Colleges. The latter have come into being through the efforts of the Chancellor's Office of the State Colleges, acting on the advice and through the efforts of Richard Raack of the Hayward regional (San Francisco Bay) team. Another benchmark of an intermediate sort is the number of subsidized teams that are making plans to continue on local funds when the federal grant runs out. Even with budgetary problems of a very severe nature, there is good reason to believe that regional operations will continue under A.H.A. sponsorship, but on local funds, in New York, California, Indiana, North Carolina, Seattle and Texas. Also perhaps in St. Louis, Boulder, and Connecticut. Some of these will be of an obviously diminished size. But the spread of information about them and the increased number of persons interested in the programs carried on by these groups, as detected from the large number of requests for information, visits, and assistance, both locally and centrally, is contributing to a general diffusion of interest and knowledge in and about history education nationally.

There are also at least two excellent benchmarks obvious within the profession as a testimony to progress in the commitment to history education, as ill-defined as it still remains. The first is the growth of interest among professional historians in this aspect of the profession, as opposed to the traditional concentration on publishing pure and simple. This is serving to make work in this area increasingly respectable. While rewards are still largely confined to traditional activities of historians, at least

work in the area of history education and the schools is no longer necessarily harmful to one's career and reputation as a scholar. Several of the best-published and most respected scholars in the profession have been working diligently with the H.E.P. Advisory Committee since its inception, while others are coming into the regional operations more actively and in greater numbers than was true in 1969. Secondly, the A.H.A., in conjunction with H.E.P. and with the State University of New York, which has pledged significant financial support, has approved the launching of a new journal. This will concentrate on the classroom, teaching, curriculum, conceptual problems, teacher-preparation and other facets of the professional experience not now treated by the Association in any depth in the A.H.R. While plans for the new journal are not yet firm enough in exact detail to make public, it is anticipated that the new journal will deal also with the schools, as well as the college classroom, and that it will treat also the intellectual and practical problem of history's relationship to the social science disciplines and the humanities, especially in the areas of conceptualization and incorporation into the curriculum of the schools and into training programs for teachers.

If the History Education Project cannot yet be evaluated except insofar as its individual teams have made inroads into the problems that exist locally and have succeeded thus far in putting together coalitions of teachers, historians, administrators, professional educationists, and school administrators to work at resolving these problems, and except as some change in attitude appears to be growing within the Association and among its members, is it also the case that the Project has nothing to recommend as yet in the way of lessons to others? It is true, perhaps, in the final sense: we are not prepared to attempt to put down for posterity the answers to the

questions: "What is history education?" "How is history best taught, and what kind of materials make for the best history in the various curricula?" "How shall we train the teachers of the future and retrain those now teaching in order best to realize the most effective education of our children about the past and its relevance to the present?" But, as a sign of progress toward these answers, we have discovered a few almost painfully obvious truths.

To the question "Where shall we begin if we are interested in the schools and their problems?", we may answer, "you have begun when you ask this question." For our experience is that most professional historians in the universities and colleges are not even aware that the schools have problems (other than those of a purely financial nature). If they are aware of this fact, then they cannot in most cases see any possible connection between these problems and them. College historians for the most part cannot understand that they are integrally involved in preparing teachers for the schools, whether consciously or unconsciously, by the mere fact that there are teachers and future teachers in their courses, and that these students are conditioned, positively or negatively, by the experience that they have in that course. From this seemingly simple observation, it is only a short step to the almost equally obvious fact that the best place for historians to begin is by going into the local schools as observers in order to learn from the experience what needs doing. It also provides an opportunity to see the working teacher in his milieu and to understand his problems and his capacities as well as those of the children in the schools. For the teacher, it is equally obvious that the professional can be brought into the local school(s) by a visit to the college or university in order to assess its potential contributions to the community schools and to invite individual faculty members to visit the classroom. Almost everywhere there

is an aura of suspicion by the school teacher of the professional historian. He is thought (often correctly) to live in an ivory tower. His proclivity for pontificating upon the problems of the schools, if indeed he even thinks and talks about them at all, tends rightly to cool the ardor of the teacher who lives with these problems daily toward working with the college community. Many historians are uncomfortable in the school classroom (and in their own?). They may cover this fear by looking down on the teacher as something less than a professional, something beneath contempt. Nothing short of honest, open-minded, continuing contact between the two breeds can serve to overcome these mutual hostilities. No program of action, however well thought-out, can hope to succeed without some amelioration of the relationship that generally prevails between the gown and the schools. It is both inexpensive and good sense to begin with such a program of visitations. Such a program, initiated in the fall, 1970, semester by seven members of the History Department at San Fernando Valley State College (without any concrete help from the History Education Project) has provided the basis of widespread cooperation between them and several Valley junior high and high schools.

There are present in every department some members, usually a majority of the total department, who are not, will not become, and cannot be interested in working with the schools in any way, shape or form. There are those who can be utilized in limited forms, such as by making occasional visits to speak at a local school at the invitation of a teacher or a group of students. There are very few historians in any college or university department who will really make any large or lasting commitment to the schools or to training-teachers for the schools. This is normal and should not be discouraging to those who are willing and able to make such a commitment. There is room in the profession for many types of persons. Some will serve by their

scholarly writing, while others serve not at all. Do not expect the man who entered the academic world as an escape from the pressures of the busy world outside to become a leader in the confrontation of today's educational issues. Nor is it vital to every program of history education that all men in any department participate. It is enough to ask from the department chairman and the elders of the group an open mind and the freedom to serve these needs as a part of one's legitimate professional commitment. It is by no means always the older men who create the stumbling blocks that do exist. Young men on the make can be even more obstinate in their resistance to change than their colleagues in any school-oriented program for fear that it will tarnish the reputation of their department, and, through the department, tarnish their personal reputations. But untenured young scholars are not usually in any position to stifle the legitimate aims of their colleagues, while older men may well do so (and, indeed, they do so).

Once started on a program, it is difficult to keep others from misinterpreting what you are doing or saying (or not doing or saying). It is entirely normal for an interest in the schools to be mistaken as an attack upon scholarship and publication. This is entirely falacious. Scholars and teachers are often the same men, though, of course, not always. A concern for "how" does not in any way indicate a lack of concern for "what" or for the quality of content. Yet it is often taken as such. One must be prepared forever to correct misinterpretations of his work in this sphere. Nor will the person attracted to work in history education escape the accusation that he has one monolithic path to salvation which he tries to force on all others. This can and has proved in the past to be true as often as not. But it need not be and should not be.

The team of historians and educationists from Washington University in St. Louis is attempting to work with seventh and eighth grade teachers from predominantly black Hamilton School in the creation of brief units on black history as a part of an attempt to balance the curriculum for the children in that school. The task was set by the identified needs of the Hamilton staff. Historians at Southern Methodist University, University of Texas at El Paso, several colleges in the San Antonio, Texas area, Texas Southern University, and two colleges in the Taos and Sante Fe, New Mexico area are working with local school teachers to develop curriculum for American Indian and Chicano students, as well as the black students in Houston. These tasks were settled upon by the schools of these areas. Some Yale historians are working with New Haven teachers on curriculum changes for 8th and 11th grade courses, for New Haven needs such work to be done. All the areas mentioned above will need to retrain teachers to handle the new materials once they are completed. Therefore, training will comprise a vital and significant portion of the activities of the teams involved. But that does not mean that others must necessarily work on curriculum or address themselves to minority groups. The need must exist locally. But all these programs will serve to tell us something about the possibilities of working on curriculum with teachers as a practical matter.

The History Department at Southern Methodist has created a new Ph.D. degree for historians. It will, they feel, better prepare future college teachers to understand the needs and conditions of the schools. California State College at Hayward was the first state college in California to create a new master's degree option in history. It ought to enable them to turn out teachers for the high schools who have a good grounding in the curriculum, pedagogy, bibliography and professional skills that are required to become

successful teachers. They also have a program to retrain existing teachers through regular college course-offerings that have been adjusted to the indentified needs of the schools, and which take place partly in the schools. The University of Washington has done this with two courses for teachers in University of Washington extension. One of these courses is interdisciplinary and will be team-taught by a historian and five social scientists. All will be asked to address themselves directly to problems brought in from a curriculum seminar which they also attend, and to that seminar from the classrooms of the teachers enrolled. This is a reality factor which may well turn out to serve the needs of teachers in the Seattle area. If successful, the Seattle program will serve to set up small centers for dissemination and change in the schools themselves, run by the teachers who have been through the program and who carry to the field the lessons and materials that proved useful to them previously. The Hayward program will make available to school districts whose teachers are enrolled in the Hayward courses a professional consultant in history for the district, to come out with his students to assist the district. No one is saying that the Hayward and Washington models for pre-service and in-service training and followup are what is needed by everyone. But both have realized that it is not enough to sever connections when the teachers leave your classes. Colleges and universities must serve as continuing resources to the local schools in whatever fashion seems dictated to best accomplish the job that needs doing.

Duke University and University of Delaware have put together, each with the help of local school personnel, traveling institutes which will hit large numbers of teachers in several districts with abundant materials and demonstrations of techniques from many social studies projects -- especially

those that emphasize a kind of "inquiry" approach to teaching and learning. We have had a good deal of experience now with three-to-four-day institutes and mass saturation of teachers. But we are not as yet prepared to say whether these are more or less effective than long-term programs with one or two school districts. Do the lessons last? Unsolicited letters from participants would indicate at least that it is far more effective an approach than the schools' normal in-service programs and costs no more.

Again, the Indiana University team is attempting to conceptualize and create materials for a new high school course in World History. This is based on an obvious conviction that if children cannot learn about, understand, and tolerate the enormous heterogeneity of the world in which we live, there is not going to be much point in learning anything else. When this course is completed, teachers, some of whom will have been in on the actual creation of the course, will have to be trained to teach it and to prepare to train others to do so. The University of Colorado team, working on an old base of interdisciplinary cooperation, has constructed a course dealing with urban problems in an multidisciplinary fashion. They are convinced that relevant problems ought to be at the center of every curriculum; that solving problems is what kids need to learn; and that this can be done with the tools of many disciplines working together. They intend to set up centers in six cities of Colorado for the dissemination of this approach and for replication and piloting of such an approach. Who is to say now whether the results of this experiment can be transported intact to similar areas for use in reforming the schools there? But it will not necessarily prove effective or even attractive to all the teams connected with H.E.P.

We have selected these examples in order to demonstrate the open-endedness and variety of H.E.P., as well as to explain why we are not yet

ready to pronounce judgment on any of our parts. We hope to be able better to document judgments made at the end of the year, when the Report to the Profession is written. But neither did we wish to give you the impression that we have not learned some preliminary lessons to date. These, too, are in this memo; as such, they, too, are subject to revision later. The one overarching consideration we wish to stress is that now is the time to start; that all beginnings ought to grow out of observation; that nothing worthwhile can be accomplished without cooperation across institutional lines, nor without sustained efforts as opposed to one-shot cures. Here is where we rest in December, 1970.

FOOTNOTES

¹Subsidized History Education Project regional teams exist now at the following places: (1) Yale - New Haven Schools; (2) Duke - Raleigh, Charlotte, and Durham County Schools; (3) State University of New York at Stony Brook - Smithtown and Three Village Schools; (4) Delaware University - Alfred I. duPont Schools; (5) University of Washington - Bellvue, Shoreline, and Seattle Schools; (6) Washington University - Hamilton School; (7) University of California at Irvine and California State College at Long Beach - Newport, Orange and Tustin Schools; (8) California State College at Hayward, San Francisco State College, College of the Holy Names - Mt. Diablo and Oakland Schools; (9) Southern Methodist University - Dallas Schools; (10) University of Colorado - Boulder Schools. Sub-regional teams are operating in cooperation with H.E.P. regional teams at: (a) University of Texas at El Paso - El Paso Schools; (b) Trinity University, Incarnate Word, St. Mary's University, and San Marcos State College - San Antonio Schools; (c) Texas Southern University - Houston Schools, New Mexico Highlands University and College of Sante Fe - Taos and Sante Fe Schools; (d) Michigan State University - East Lansing Schools (in planning).

Finally, H.E.P. regional teams existed last year at Indiana University (now on own funding); University of New Mexico - Albuquerque Schools (discontinued) and San Diego State College - San Diego Schools (will become a part of California State College operation, along with perhaps seven to ten new campus operations in 1971).

²The American Political Science Association's Pre-collegiate Education Project came into being at Indiana University in 1970. In its first year, it has been more of a holding agency for already-existing programs throughout the country than an originator of new ones. As such, it may prove to be a good mechanism for coordination and focus within the profession. It is directed by Professor Lee Anderson, 1129 Atwater Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

³The Advisory Committee is composed now of William Taylor (chairman), State University of New York at Stony Brook; Thomas Pressly, University of Washington (from Committee on Teaching); Robert Palmer, Yale University, President of the American Historical Association (from the Council); Theodore von Laue, Clark University (from Committee on the Ph.D.); Paul Ward, Executive Secretary, American Historical Association; John Rumbarger, Assistant Executive Secretary, American Historical Association; Leo Solt, Indiana University (at-large); Charles Sellers, University of California at Berkeley (at-large); John Guthrie, Counseling and Guidance, University of Pittsburgh; Phillip Woodruff, Westport, Connecticut Schools; H. Donn McCafferty, Vermont Department of Education (liaison with S4C).



